

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/644,112	BLUM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jordan M. Schwartz	2873	

**All Participants:**

(1) Jordan M. Schwartz.

(2) Ed Garcia-Otero.

**Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 20 September 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

28, 30

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicant's representative stating that the proposed change to claim 28 (within the after final amendment) concerning the language "at least one of" presented a new issue and would prompt an advisory action. The proposed change to claim 28 as set forth in the examiner's amendment concerning the language "a wearer's refractive error other than..." was discussed and agreed upon to place this claim and the application in condition for allowance. The other change to claim 28 as set forth in the examiner's amendment was discussed and agreed upon to provide additional clarity to the claim. It was also agreed to cancel claim 30 since it is inconsistent with claim 29 as amended in applicant's after final amendment. For applicant's information, and as requested by applicant for clarification, the agreed upon examiner's amendment to claim 28 concerning the limitation "the lens blank corrects a wearer's refractive error other than myopia, hyperopia, presbyopia, and regular astigmatism" is not interpreted by the examiner as precluding the lens blank from providing correction for other refractive errors as well.